Copy to Mysore State

P 11 E

Hand (1953) Department.

Ms SERIES.

G.O. NO. 2325

Dated 25.7.53

FOR MYSORE STATE

[Despatch Abstract.]

MHS. stage carrier - Hanumakonda
in Convenience owing out of stay
orders of High Court allowing bus
the petitioners and the respondent
before it to ply buses pending
his final ? W.P. Instructions
to Govt Pleader - Dasara

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
THURSDAY, the Sixteenth day of October
One thousand nine hundred and firty two

Present.

The Honourable Mr.Justice Chandra Reddy.

Civil Mis.Petition No.9269 of 1952.

Venegalla Narayana ... Petitioner (Petitioner in W.P. No.744 of 1952 on the file of the High Court.)

1.Central Traffic Board by its Secretary, Egmore, Madras.
2. The Stateof Madras represented by the Secretary, Home Dept.
3. Ghanta Venkata Krishayya
4. Nagalla Sivarama Krishnayya. ... Respondents (Respondents in do.

Petition praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith the High Court will be pleased to stay the operationof the order of the 1st Respondent Board in R.No. 5702/A-3/52 dated 17-4-1952 pending disposal of W.P.No.744 of 1952 on the file of the High Court petition to issue a writ of certiorarari calling for the records in the said R.No.5702/A3/52 dated ~~17-~~ 17-4-52 and in G.O.Ms.No.3598 Home Dept.dated 8-10-1952 and to quash the order made therein.

ORDER

This petition coming on for hearing upon perusing and the affidavit filed in the writ petition No.744 of ~~kk~~ 1952 on the file of the High Court and upon hearing the arguments of Mr.K.Raja Ayyar and Mr.M.Manavalachowdry Advocates for the petitioner and Messrs. N.V.B.Shankar Rao and B.Punyakoti Chetti taking notice on behalf of the respondents 3 and 4 IT IS ORDERED that pending disposal of Writ Petition No.744 of 1952 on the file of the High Court the petitioner as well as the Respondents 3 and 4 herein shall be at liberty to run their buses.

Sd/ V.Gopala Ayyar,
Asst. Registrar, Appellate Side.
/True copy/

1.The State of Madras represented by the Secretzry, Home Dept. Fort St. George Madras.
2.The Centgral Traffic Board by its Secretary Egmore Madras.
3.The Regional Transport Authority Guntur.
4.Carbon Copy to Mr.Manavala Chowdry on payment of usual charges.
/True copy/

Copy of letter No.21345 /A3/52 dated 7-11-1952 of the Transport Commissioner, Egmore Madras to the Secretary to Govt. Home Dept. Madras.

Sub:- Motor Vehicles -Stage Carriages - Regional Transport Authority, Guntur -Route Tenali to Repalli -Grant of. permits W.P.No.744/52 on the file of the High Court.

Ref:- High Court order in CMP.No.9269/52 dt . 16-10-1952.

In their order in CMP.No.9269/52 dated 16-10-1952 copy enclosed for ready reference, the High Court has directed that the petitioner before the Court as well as Respondents No.3 and 4 shall be at liberty to run their buses pending disposal of the main writ petition No.744/52 the administrative difficulties involved in implementing the orders of such nature were already raised in the Boards letter No.46176/A1/52 dated 17-12-1951, Rc.No.54136/ A1/52

dated 28-12-1951 and R.No.53721/A3/51 dated 25-1-1952 In Memo.No.207710/Tr.II/51-4 dated 4-3-52 the Govt. replies that the High Court was of the opinion that the administrative difficulties and inconvenience caused on this account were not insurmountable. In the Board's letter No.45680/A2/51 dated 5-7-52 the legal position that the High Court would appear to have no powers to issue permits under the Motor Vehicles Act or to direct the issue of permits by Central Road Traffic Board or Regional Transport Authorities was raised. In that connection it was also pointed out that apart from the offence of plying a bus without a permit the operator could com it innumerable other offences with impunity if he were to ply the buses without permits in pursuance of the orders of the High Court. The particular case was not however pursued further since the main writ petition in which this question was raised was disposed of by then by the High Court but the point raised is still giving trouble in other cases -vide Government Memo.No.70244 Tr.II/52-7 Home dated 26-7-52.

It is now observed that the High Court is again issuing similar directions permitting the petitioners before them to ply their buses in spite of the fact that they hold no valid permits to ply their vehicles on public roads in conformity with the provisions of Motor Vehicles Act and Rules thereunder. For the reasons already urged, the Board requests that the Govt. may be pleased to request the Govt. Pleader to take up the matter with the High Court again with an appropriate petition so as to get the position clarified. I also request to be informed of the course of action, to be adopted by the Regional Transport officer, when an operator plies his vehicle without complying with the provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act and Rules and the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act (e.g.without paying tax, with out conforming to any timings, ~~xixixxxxxxxxxxx~~without any overload rstrictions, without conforming to speed limit etc) under cover of the High Court's orders. In my opinion the proper course would be to launch a prosecution for plying a vehicle without a permit on the ground that a High Court no substitute for a order is competent authority under the Motor Vehicles Act; permit, issued by the the legal position can then be contested incourt.

ØTrue copyØ

Home (Tr.II)Dept.

Memo.No.45805 Tr.II/53-2 dated 25-3-53.

M.Vs.Stage carriages - Administrative inconvenience arising out of stay orders of High Court allowing both the petitioner and the respondent before it to ply buses pending disposal of writ petitions.

--

A copy of letter No.21345 A3/52 dated 7-11-52 from the Transport Commissioner, Madras is enclosed. As W.P.No.744/52 onthe file of the High Court, Madras, referred to in that letter has since been disposed of by the High Court in its order d/15-12-52 no action is called for with reference to the T.C's letter referred to above so far as the above W.P.is concerned But as regards the general question raised in para 2 of the T.C' letter referred to above, the attention of the Govt. pleader, Madras is invited to the correspondence mentioned below:-

i) Memo.No.207710 Tr.II/51-9 Home dated 15-7-1952.
ii) Letter from the G.P.Madras No.6206 d/8-9-52 in reply to the Memo.referrrd to above and
iii) Lwtter fromthe G.P. Madras No.10776 dated 5/6.12.1952 relating to W.P.No.760/52.

Govt. are advised that the Supreme court's observation in the case of Raman and Raman vs. Veerappa Pillai that the direction of the High Court to the Transport Authorities to issue a permit is clearly in excess of its powers and jurisdiction still holds the field and that in proceedings for writ of certiorari, the High Court has the power to quash the subordinate tribunal's orders and not to substitute its own, whether the final order or in the interim orders, and that therefore the High Court's orders allowing petitioners for writs before it to run their buses pending orders on their petitions would be clearly wrong. The G.P.Madras is therefore requested to bring this consideratio to the notice of the High Court, whenever it proposes to issue interim orders allowing the petitioner as well as the respt. before it to ply their buses on the concerned route, pending disposal of the W.P.and to report to Govt.the result of the action taken by him in the first case that may arise next so tha Govt. may consider the question of preferring an appeal to the Supreme court,if necessary, so as to have the position clearly laid down.

To
The G.P.Madras.
(with a copy of
P.3 c.f.) T
Copy to the T.C.
Egmore Madras.

J.J.
D/25/3/53
V.H.R
d/25/3/53.

Memo.No.45805 Tr.II/53-2 dated 30-5-53

M.Vs.Stage carriages - Administrative inconvenience -arising out of stay orders of High Court allowing both the petitioner and the respondent before it to ply buses pending disposal of writ petitions.

Rer:- Govt.Memo.No.45805 Tr.II/53-2 Home d/25-3-53 and Exchange Reminder d/30-4-53-

The Govt.Pleader, Madras is requested to state whether any case as referred to in the concluding sentence of the memo. cited has arisen so far, if so whether he brought the facts to the notice of the High Court as suggested in the reference cite and what orders were passed by the High Court.

J.J.
d/30/5/53.

To
The G.P.Madras-1.
R.D.29/6/53.

Home(Tr.I)Dept.

Cxxx G.O.Ms.No.2375 dated 25-7-1953.

M.Vs.Stage Carriages -Administrative inconvenience arising out of stay orders of High Court allowing both the petr.and the respondent before it to ply buses pending disposal of W.P. Instructions to G.P.Madras - Issued.

Read:- 1.Memo.No.45805 Tr.II-53-2 Home dated 25-3-53.
2.Lr.from the G.P.Madras No.6662 d/5-6-1953.

ORDER:

The T.C.Madras brought to the notice of the Govt. certai instances where the High Court cxxxxxxxx issued interim orders allowing the petr.as well as the respondent before it to ply

before it to ply their buses on the route concerned pending dispossl of the W.Ps.before it, and reported that admin tra-tive difficulties were involved in implementing orders of such a nature. Instructions were issued in the Govt. Memo.cited above to the G.P.Madras to bring the above ~~taxiha~~ consideration to the notice of the High Court whenever it proposed to issue interim orders allowing the petr. as well as the respondent, before it to ply their buses on the concerned route, pending disposal of the W.P. before it.

2. The G.P.Madras has now brought to the notice of the Govt. that in C.M.P.5039 in W.P.391/53 the advocate for the petr. requested the High Court to permit both the petr as well as the respondent to ply their buses pending the disposal of the W.P. and that when he appraised the Hon'ble judge of the administrative inconvenience that is likely to result if the petr's request were granted, the Hon'ble the judge agreed with him and refused the request of the petr's advocate.

3. The G.P. Madras is informed that the above instruc-tions can be taken to be standing instructions for similar cases in the future and that when in any specific case the High Court does not concede the G.P.'s request, the matter should be brought to the notice of the Govt.

J.J.
d/23/7/53

To
The G.P.Madras.
Copy to the Secy.C.R.T
Bd.Madras.
Copy for S.F.
Copy for Andhra S.F.
Copy for Mysore S.F.
Copy for Tr.I.section.
Copy for Andhra State.
Copy for Mysore State.
Copy one s/c copy for
cts.III.

M.Vs.Stage Carriages -Administrative inconveniences arising out of stay orders of High Court allowing both the petitioner and the respondent before it ply buses pending disposal of writ petitions.

From the Transport Commissioner No.21345/A3/52 d/7-11-1952.

--

The High Court in its order dated 16-10-52 has ordered that pending disposal of W.P.No.744 of 1952 on its file, the petr. as well as the respondents shall be at liberty to run their buses. This aspect was examined in para 1 on pp.3-4 ante and the Govt. Pleader has been requested to move the High Court if he has not already done so, and get its order suitably modified. His attention has also been drawn to the instructions in Memo.No.207710 Tr.II/51-9, Home dated 15-7-1952. The Govt.pleader's reply to the memo. on p.25 c.f. is awaited and he has been reminded twice. The case stands posted to 25-11-52.

The T.C. for the reasons stated in his letter on p.35 c.f. has requested the Govt. to direct the Govt.Pleader to take up the matter with the High Court again with an appropriate petition so as to get the position clarified. As the G.P. has already been asked to move the High Court in the matter no action seems called for on this suggestion.

The T.C. has also requested to be informed of the course of action to be adopted by the R.T.O. when an operator plies his vehicle without complying with the provisons of the M.V.Act and Rules and the M.F.T.Act i.e.g.

of the M.V.Act and Rules and the M.V T.Act (e.g. without paying tax, without conforming to any timings, without any overload restrictions, without conforming to speed limit etc) under cover of the High Court's order. He considers that the proper course would be to launch a prosecution for plying a vehicle without a permit, on the ground that the High Court's order is no substitute for a permit issued by the competent autority under the M.V. Act and that the Legal position can then be contested in court.

The Supreme court in Civil Appeal No.159/51 has held that the direction of the High Court to the Transport authorities to issue a permit to a particular person etc. is clearly in excess of its powers and jurisdiction. It therefore appears that the High Court cannot allow by its direction even temporarily the petitioners before them to run their vehicles also on the route pending disposal of the writ petition. On the other hand, it appears that they can only stay the order appealed against and leave it to the discretion of the Traansport authorities to act further in the matter, taking into consideration the public interest. The Legal Dept.have already stated that such orders of the High Court lack legal validity.

In the circumstances it seems that the Transport authorities would be justified in launching a prosecution against such operators who ply without a permit on the strength of the High Court's stay order . However Legal (Opns) may be requested to advise.

J.J.R.
14-11-52

M G.
15-11-52.

Legal (Opinions-B)Dept.

While there is no doubt that the High Court is wrong in allowing operators to ply their vehicles, it is not correct to say that if an operator plies his vehicles on the basis of an order of the High Court directing or permitting the plying of the vehicles such plying would be illegal. A prosecution for running without a permit under those circumstances would not succeed. But it is otherwise with regard to prosecutions even in the case of such operators as regards non -payment of tax, overloading overspeeding etc. However, the Govt.pleader has reported that the writ petition is coming up for final disposal tomorrow (25.11.52) The Govt. Pleader has already been directed in the Memo at page 25 c.f. to get the order of the High Court at page 1c suitably modified and he is very likely to move the High Court in the matter. So before considering or approving the suggestion of the Transport Commissioner at M. on page 35 c.f. it is desirable to see the terms of the order which the High Court will pass. A copy of the order may therefore be obtained expeditiously and the point considered further in the light of the High Court's order.

Home Dept.

As regards the point raised by the C.R.T.Board in para 2 on p.3 c. f. please see paras 3-4 of this Department's note and the Legal Department's note on p. 1-2- ante. Now that the W.P. has been dismissed by the High Court and as the C.R.T.Board has not reported any specific irregularity committed by the petitioner before the High Court no further action seems called for on this point so far as this particular case is concerned. But the point raised by the Board seems to be a general one. Legal may see for remarks again with reference to their note above.

Legal (Opns) may see again for advice after the issue of the references.

M.B.S.
d/19/1/53

V.H.Rao.
d/19/1/53.

Legal (Drafting-A)Dept.

As already stated by this Dept. in its previous note above the interim order of the High Court at p.1 c.f. allowing an operator to ply his buses without permits would be clearly wrong. But the Govt. or the Transport Authorities cannot disregard such an order and prosecute the operator merely on the ground that he is plying his buses without permits. The appropriate wayof dealing ~~with such a situation would be to bring to dealing with~~ such a situation would be bring to the notce of the High Court in every case where such an order is proposed to be made, the complications involved ingiving effect to such an order and to request the High Court not to pass such as order.

Home Dept.

With reference to the portion marked (M) in the Transport Commissioner's latter on p.3 c.f. please see para 5 of this Dept's note on p.2 ante and the Legal Dept. note on p.2-3 above The Transport Commr. may be informed as at (Z) in the Legal Dept.'s note above.

--

With reference to the portion marked (X) in the Legal Dept's note above it is submitted that the Govt.'s point of view in regard to the adminstrative inconvenienced that arise by the High Court permitting both the parties to ply buses on a particular route has alreadybeen urged before the High Court on more than one occasion in the past and the High Court has not accepted the view point. The Govt.pleader Madras reported in Feb.1952 that their Lordships observed that the adminstrative inconvenience felt by the Govt. was not insurmontable.In another case of W.P.rlating to the grant of permit on the route Pudukottai to Pattukottai the Govt. Pleader Madras brought to the notice of the High Court the serious inconvenience resulting from its allowing both the parties to ply on the same route pending disposal of the W.P. But the High Court expressed its view that in as much as both the parties had purchased buses in pursuance of the orders of the Transport Authorities and paid taxes on them it would be proper to allow both the parties to run their bus on thesame route. In the circumstances it is for orders whether any further instructions need be issued to the Govt. Pleader, Madras apart from those already issued in the Memo. at pp.23-24 c.f. of the file at (K).

Did not the G.P. report sometime back that the High Court has said that it would not issue such orders in future.

J.J.R.
18/2/53.

With reference to the query of A.S. extracted above, please see the note and the marginal orders of A.S. on p.2 n.f of the L.F.III With reference to the Memo.at pp.23-24 c.f. of (K) the G.P. reported on 9-8-1952 that he had noted the suggestion in the memo.referred to above, that nowadays such orders were not passed and that when the first opportinity occurred he would mention this aspect to the court. Subsequently in connection with W.P. No.760 of 1952 relating to the grant of permit on the route Pattukkottai to Pudukkottai the G.P. reported in his letter d/6-12-52 that he submitted the

the serious inconvenience which resulted by reason of the High Court allowing both the parties to ply buses on the same route but that the High Court in view of the fact that both the operators had purchased buses in pursuance of the orders of the transport authorities and had paid taxes thereon, observed that it would be proper to allow both the parties to run their buses on the same route..

Presumably the High Court is not aware of the fact that when a permit granted by a R.T.A. is set aside by the C.R.T.Bd. in appeal or by the Govt. in revision or when the permit granted by the C.R.T. bd. in appeal is set aside by the Govt. in revision the permit granted by the R.T.A. or the C.R.T.Bd. as the case may be ceases to be in force and consequently the R.T.A's guantee or the C.R.T. bd's grante, as the case may be, cannot run his bus on the strength of the permit granted by the R.T.A. or by the C.R.T.Board, as the case may be. The Govt. pleader, Madras, may perhaps be asked to bring to the notice of the High Court the poston as set out above and also the points raised by the T.C. in his letter at p.1 c.f. and to ask for a clear ruling from the High Court whether it is its intention that irrespective of whether a party before it holds a valid permit or not, he should be allowed to ply his bus until the W.P. is disposed of. Legal may be requested to advise.

G.P. should also urge the other point that in view of the Supreme court Judgment in Raman and Raman vs. Veerappa Pillai case, the High Court has no power to direct both the parties to ply

J.J.R.
5/3/53

V.H.R.
d/5/3/53.

LEGAL (OPN)DEPT.

Legal (Drafting -A)Dept. "A" at page 4 is a simple proposition and it is unnecessary to ask the Govt. Pleader to bring it to the notice of the High Court. The Supreme court's observation in the case of Raman and Raman vs. Veerappa Pillai that the direction of the High Court to the Transport authorities to issue a permit is clearly in excess of its ~~xxxx~~ powers and jurisdiction still holds the field. In proceedings for writ of Certiorai the High Courts has the power to quash the subordinate tribunals's orders and not to substitute its own, whether in the final orders or in the interim orders. So the High Court's orders allowing petitioner for writs before it to run their buses pending orders on their petitions would be clearly wrong. Whenever the High Court proposes to issue such ordes this consideration should be brought to its notice. If this practice is not stopped it would be necessary to file an appeal to the Supreme court in respect of one of such orders to have the position clearly laid down. The Govt. Pleader as well as the Advocate General may be consulted when one such concrete case arises. Meanwhile instructions on the above lines may issue to the Govt.Pleader.

Home(Tr.II)Dept.

With reference to the Legal Dept.'s note on p.5 ante a draft Memo.to the Govt. Pleader, Madras is submitted for approval. It does not seem necessary to circulate the file at this stage.

J.J.R.
25/3/

V.H.R.
d/25/3/53.

(Issued as Memo.No.45805 RxTr.II/53-2 dated 25-3-53.)

With ref.to 'A' on pp.5-6 c.f. the G/P.Madras has not brought any case to the notice of the Govt.where the High Court has proposed to issue interim orders allowing the petitioner as well as the respondent before it to ply their buses on the concerned route pending disposal of the W.P. He may, however be asked whether any case has arisen so far and if so whether he brought to the notice of the High Court the position as set out at 'B' on p.5 c.f. Draft Memo.subd. is for consideration.

J.J.R.
d/30/5/53.

Issued as Memo.No.45805 Tr.II/53-3 dated 30/5/53.
Fromthe G.P.Madras letter No.6662 dated 5/6/53.

--

(Summary)

The T.C. Madras brought to the notice of the Govt. certain instances/where the High Court issued interim orders allowing the petr. as well as the respondent before it to ply their buses on the route concerned pending disposal of the W.Ps. before it and reported that administrative difficulties were involved in implementing orders of such a nature. In that connection, it was observed that when a permit granted by a R.T.A.was set aside by the C.R.T.Bd. in appeal or by the Govt. in revision or when the permt granted by the C.R.T.Bd. in appeal was set aside by the Govt. in revision, the permit granted by the R.T.A. or the C.R.T.Bd. as thecase may be,ceased to be in force and consequently the R.T.A's grantee or the C.R. T.Bd. grantee as the case may be could not run his bus on the strength of the permit granted by the R.T.A. or by the C.R. T.Bd.as the case may be . In order to avoid all such administrative inconveniences consequent upon the orders of the High Court of the nature referred to at 'M' above, it was proposed that the G.P. Madras should be instructed to bring the above aspect to the notice of the High Court. The Legal Dept.however advised that in proceedings for writ of certiorari, the High Court has the power to quash the subordinate tribunals's order but not to substitute its own, whether in the final orders or in the interim orders, that in view of this the High Court's orders allowing the petitioners for writs before it to run their buses pending orders on their petitions would be clearly wrong and that whenever the High Court proposed to issue such orders this consideration may be brought to the notice. That Dept. also stated that if this practice is not stopped it would be necessary to file an appeal to the Supreme court in respect of one of such order to have the position clearly laid down and that the G.P. as well as the Advocate General might be consulted when one such concret case arose. They advised that instructions onlines at 'X' above might be issued to the G.P.

2. Instructions were accordingly issued to the G.P. Madras to bring the above consideration to the notice of the High Court, whenever it proposed to issue interim orders allowing the petr. as well as the respondent before it to ply their buses on the concerned route, pending disposal of the W.P.before it . He was also directed to report to Govt. the result of the action taken by him in the first case that arose so that Govt.may consider the question of preferring an appeal to the Supreme court, if necessary so as to have the position clearly laid down.

Copy of the letter from the Govt. Pleader High Court Madras. to the Secretary to Govt.Home Department,Madras.No.6662 dated 5-6-53.

--

Sub: Motor Vehicles -Stage Carriages -Administrative inconvenience - Arising out of stay orders of High Court allowing both the petitioners and the respondent before it to ply buses pending disposal of writ petitions.

Ref:- Govt. Memo.No.45805 Tr.II/53-3 dated 30-5-53.

--

With reference to your memo.cited I am to state that in C.M.P. 5039 in Writ Petition 391/53, the petitioner requested the court to permit both the buses to ply pending the disposal of the writ petition , I was in court when the request was made before his Lordship the Hon'ble Mr.Justice P.V.Balakrishnan Iyer and when I apprised His Lordship of the Administrative inconvenience that is likely to result if the petitioners requests were granted. his Lordship agreed with me and refused the request of the petitioner's Advocate.

/True copy/

(Home Tr.II)Dept.

Memo.No.45805 Tr.II/53-2 dated 25-3-53.

M.Vs.stage carriages -Administrative inconvenience arising out of stay orders of High Court allowing both the petitioner and the respondent before it to ply buses pending disposal of writ petitions.

--

A copy of letter No.21345 A3/52 dated 7-11-52 from the Transport Commissioner, Madras is enclosed. As W.P.No.744/52 on the file of the High Court, Madras referred to inthat letter has since been disposed of by the High Court in its order d/18-12-52 no action is called for with ref. to the T.C's letter referred to above so far as the above W.P. is concerned But as regards the general question raised in para 2 of the T.C's letter referred to above, the attention of the Govt. Pleader, Madras is invited to the correspondence mentioned below:-

3. In his letter on p.9 c.f. the G.P. has stated that in C.M.P.5039 in W.P.391/53 the advocate for the petr. requested the Court to permit both the petr. as well as the respondent to ply their buses pending the disposal of the w.p. and that when the appraised the Hon'ble judge of the administrative inconvenience that is likely to result if the petr's requests were granted the Hon'ble the judge agreed with him and refused the request of the petr's advocate.

4. Though the G.P. Madras will no doubt, act likewise in future on all occasions when such cases arise, it would appear desirable to issue a genral order that cases of the type in question should be opposed by the G.P. and the result reported to Govt. Subject to orders, a draft order is subd.for approval.

5. The question of taking action as at 'Y' above, may be considered as and when any specific case in which the High Court does not agree with the G.P. is brought to the notice of Govt.

May be circulated to M.(I & L).

J.J.R.
15/6/53.

The draft may be approved.

J.S.
21/6/53.

X,Y.Z in the Govt. order may be good reasons and points. But should it appear in a G.O. If it is brought to the notice of the High Court, willit not be taken as threat. I suggest X.Y.Z. be omitted and the rest go as the G.O, Does legal and department that it is obsolutely necessary to include X, Y.Z in the G.O. If legal thinks it necessary, it may go otherwise I am for dropping it in G.O.

Please see the minutes of M.(I & L) above. Legal may see for remarks w r.t. X Y Z above.

The order is beings communicated only to our law officer i.e the G.P- and there will be no necessity or opportunity for producing it in court. The G.O. contains only instructions to the G.P. and does not appear to be in the nature of a threat. It seems also necessary to retain the portions referred for a proper understanding the position. Legal (Opn) may see as directed by M (I & L).

J.J.R.
29/6/53.
J.S.
6/7/53.

Legal(Opinion)

There is no objection to omitting the portions marked X,Y.Z. from the draft.

Home (Tr.II)Dept.

Legal have no objection to omitting the portions marked X,Y.Z from the draft order. For orders whether the draft order may issue omitting the portions referred to . Subject to orders a revised draft order is submitted below for approval.

J.J.R.
/23/7/53.

Revised draft approved.

J.S.
d/24th July 1953.